

## ARMS ON THE CAMPUS : GUNNING FOR GREATNESS

STANFORD RSCH INST  
Menlo Park, Cal.  
FOR: U.S. ARMY  
ARMY CHEMICAL CENTER  
Edgewood, MD  
CATEGORY: CHEMICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS  
PLEASE: RSCH  
AMT: \$1, 132, 000  
PROJECT: CLASSIFIED CONTRACT FOR RESEARCH WORK

For a long time I thought that the industrial-military complex was a mental disease of the American left, but my eyes of late keep returning to these electric typewriter listings of our government's research and development contracts in aerospace and defense. I find them all but inscrutable and decidedly evil. Members of the GCU and the SCPV have been doing research on Stanford's relation to the armaments industry and the Defense Department. These strange listings are part of the material they collected. It is very unnerving to wonder what the hell those little men in the white coats are doing with \$1,132,000 secret dollars for chemical warfare. Whow, anyway, do they want to kill?

STANFORD RSCH INST  
MENLO PARK, CAL  
FOR: ARMY CHEMICAL CENTER  
CHEM-BIO-RADIOLOG  
Edgewood, MD  
CATEGORY: CHEMICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS  
PLEASE: RSCH  
AMT: \$2, 511, 000  
PROJECT: RSCH STUDIES ON DISSEMINATION OF SOLID AND LIQUID AGENTS  
COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CM

If Stanford University is trembling on the brink of greatness, it has achieved that precarious position, in large measure, through the military and scientific buildup of the Cold War. One can date the great leap forward from the creation of Stanford Research Institute. The Institute was founded in 1946 by the President of the University and other business and industrial leaders; it is a non-profit corporation governed by a board of directors selected by and sometimes from the Stanford Trustees. The University president serves as board president. The purpose of SRI is to create a pool of scientists and research experts and to establish a center for the accumulation and development of information and techniques useful to business, industry, and government; its subsidiary function is to attract money, prestige, and talented men to the University. Since the creation of the State of National Emergency at the time of the Korean War, the major source of money for both SRI and Stanford has been the United States Government. Some of the contracts they give are for devising and perfecting ways of killing people, some are for saving people from systems already devised, and many do not have to do with mass murder at all. A measure of the importance of Stanford as a research center is the fact that SRI is the fifth and Stanford University the thirteenth largest nonprofit military contractors in the country in experimental, developmental, testing and research work.

Whatever one feels about the Cold War itself, one wishes to state the University's involvement in it with a kind of moral neutrality. The fact is that most Americans have profited in one way or another from the Cold War, including the Civil Rights movement. Indeed, for an American to refuse money ill-got or given with impure intentions would condemn him to a more than monastic asceticism. But in a sufficiently dismal state of mind, one sees a pattern in all this: SRI and Stanford re-

search and develop weapons, the corporations watch the Stanford Trustees and the SRI Directors represent manufacture them, and the government pays the bill. The scientists get good jobs, the university gets money for expensive scientific equipment and acquires a national reputation which attracts good faculty and students, the businessmen get rich, stockholders thrive, and the United States remains the most powerful country in the world. Not an unscratched back in the room and in Vietnam where bacus are known to be lousy due to political underdevelopment we are personally, as it were, purging the flesh of the peasants.

Fortunately, the matter is not so simple. Society should finance scientific research. The major portion of the research conducted at Stanford and SRI in areas like space technology and medicine is both admirable and necessary. And it makes sense, even if one hates the idea, to have a single center at which all the banks in California, say, can have the investigations of their public image conducted by the same methods and standards.

This conjunction of university, scientist, bureaucrat, and business answers the real and legitimate needs of the parties involved. At the same time, what makes the relationship possible is what pollutes it: the armaments race. Aside from abuses of power and position--which one should expect and try to minimize--the objectionable thing is the facility, indeed the aesthetic, of an arrangement which makes weaponry so universally profitable.

The situation at Stanford is, moreover, only an example of a most dismaying set of facts about American social and political life. We desire, in the middle of this vile century, certain goods which no longer seem unattainable: civil liberty, social justice, political stability, cultural and material plenty; but one of the central facts of our life

is that, somehow, for reasons not wholly accountable, our scientists have delivered into the hands of the politicians, men sometimes ignorant and sometimes corrupt, instruments of appalling, incalculable destructive force. Another fact, though this is a variable, is American foreign policy. Our actions in Vietnam, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic seem to indicate that our present policy is to attack unilaterally any Communist society or movement anywhere in the world if it seems likely that we can get away with it. That is, not only do we have a terrifying arsenal, but we are, rightly or wrongly, a belligerent power.

It is tempting to see all this as a replay of Eden, the latest perpetration of a primal evil act. "Our fathers sowed their serpents' seeds of light," Robert Lowell writes, and "light is where the landless blood of Cain is burning, burning the unburied grain." One wants to assent because the issues have become so complicated, because it is a way of disciplining indifference, and because tearing newspaper pictures of Edward Teller into little pieces is not, finally, a very satisfying activity. Besides it is as sensible to hate Fate or Mankind as it is to hate Science and, anyway, none of this helps us much to live with the postlapsarian facts.

The politicians and generals, in order to extend the efficiency and variety of our instruments for killing, are financing important areas of American education and all the universities have their hands out. To cope with this fact, one must, ultimately, decide what he thinks of the whole armaments enterprise and what he thinks the university is. More important, the academic community at large must develop a position on these issues. For if one feels that the vast American enterprise of nuclear warfare is an evil, and that the university is a repository of human values and humane intelligence, then one must act on the conclusion that the university should do as little as possible to facilitate the expansion of weaponry.

Stanford's involvement in defense creates at the outset three serious problems. First, it endangers the autonomy of the university because of direct economic dependence on the federal government and because of the dependence of its businessmen-trustees on the armaments economy. The question of money and autonomy is so widespread--witness Berkeley--and the forthcoming legislative investigations--that it admits of no easy answers. The Stanford Trustees have, apparently, exercised discretion in dealing with conflicts of interest and with academic affairs, but the danger remains.

Federal influence on the university can take many forms. In American Universities and Federal Research, Charles V. Kidd writes: "Some federal agencies -- the Department of Defense in particular -- have missions of such agency that they are impelled to view universities such as they view industrial concerns, as organizations with people and facilities which can produce results important to national defense. These federal agencies cannot view the universities as institutions with unique and indispensable functions that must, in the interest of a politically, economically, and militarily sound nation, be performed well. The restless, single-minded drive toward the attainment of an operating objective of a federal agency -- such as the rapid development of an effective intermediate range and intercontinental ballistic missile -- can create points of conflict with universities. Continuing frictions seem inevitable if the total effect of the actions of all federal agencies is strong pressure to change universities, against their wills, into research organizations."

This kind of pressure does not hold out much promise for the quality of teaching and it is as alarming as the kind of political pressure which can be brought to bear on the teachers themselves. Kidd records instances in which funds for unclassified research have been denied to professors charged with political unorthodoxy, improper associations, past contributions to currently unpopular

causes, and leftist tendencies. This practice has, apparently, been brought under control in recent years, but government agencies still have virtually unlimited discretion to determine the terms and conditions under which research funds will be made available.

Secondly, Stanford has become a willing agent of nuclear war by participating directly in the extension of the destructive capabilities of the military and by receiving income from the armaments industry as it does in Stanford Industrial Park. This situation requires the establishment of faculty-administration committees which can pass on the acceptability to a humane institution of defense contracts, investment, and income properties.

Thirdly, the willingness of the university to permit classified research is a gross breach of academic freedom. Since the university is based on the non-national, non-political ideal of free and open inquiry, the existence of research conducted in secret for political reasons is wholly unacceptable and the Academic Council, by allowing it to go on, has failed in its responsibility. Many universities do not permit classified research or classified doctoral dissertations, Harvard among them. The position of the Stanford administration has been to leave the decision up to individual professors. How many classified contracts have been turned down I cannot know, but there is classified research conducted and there are doctoral dissertations locked in safes on the campus. Even if you, with Dr. Teller, love the bomb, this violates your academic freedom.

(continued on page four)



## SOME THOUGHTS ON VIETNAM:

# "AND FROM AMERICA THE GOLDEN FLEECE"

Even Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine talks of America as an enchanted land of golden fleece, although I suppose the "America" of immigrant vocabularies--that magic vision--was never a reality and always a wonderful dream we have all at heart known to be untrue. Nevertheless, it seems to me that we are all of us in America convinced that never, never was a dream so teasingly within reach. It is an opinion which in a significant sense classifies us as Americans. The moral outrage which spans the political spectrum and finds its expression in obsessive exposure of the things that are wrong with America--and God knows there are many--is there because we can see in the distance, like Jay Gatsby looking out in yearning at the vague green light on a faraway pier, a potentiality, the fruition of an ancient promise. The dream encompasses many, though not, as some people might ask us to believe, all virtues: tolerance; physical, intellectual, and moral freedom; clarity; vigor; humaneness; democracy; individualism; physical well-being--that is, prosperity; space, in the sense of elbow room; fair play; humor; impudence. There are of course faults: political ignorance, a dearth of tradition, bad taste, wastefulness, ingenuousness rather than innocence, violence, anti-intellectualism, a harping on appearances--but I want to concentrate on the virtues, and on what is happening to them in the contemporary world.

I say contemporary world because I wish to talk about more than Vietnam although Vietnam is my subject. Actually I am not so much concerned with the facts of the war or with the political issues--for those are not, I think, the most distressing aspects of the situation, even though we need to talk about, and need to understand the truth about them. What is paramount is what is happening to the tenor of life in our society. The issues in the war are often narrowed and thus oversimplified into pacifist issues: that killing soils the human being; the situation is not quite this simple; death is involved in the ugliness of the situation, but surely the ugliness is not limited to death. What I find most distressing about this war is not that it is in fact war but that it is an announcement that our government is wholeheartedly committing itself to--sometimes it seems more accurate to say that it is wholeheartedly lapsing into--a power struggle for its own sake, committing itself to a world in which all nations are imperialists of one form or another. This lapse seems to me a particularly potent threat to those values which we all want to be enduring in American life, a threat far more insidious than the threat to values which comes naturally in time of war. As George Orwell has remarked, in most wars it is necessary to choose sides, such as we may dislike it; one side is usually more right than the other, and, as long as through the verbiage of diplomacy we can somewhere arrive at the remains of an ideal, there is some hope even in war. It is when nations fight for power alone and when one cannot see significant differences between the antagonists, when one cannot choose, that one tends to despair. And this seems to me precisely the situation we have allowed to arise in Vietnam, a situation our government seems to be accepting with relief.

We are becoming a despotic government in Vietnam, and in some ways we have acted like a despotic government at home. The aim of our war (there is to contain China, and thus to control the little nations around her). This objective--the difficulty in making it sound appealing, and the difficulty in bringing containment into actuality--has caused the introductions into political dialogue and into daily life of deceit, bullying, censorship, brutality--of the blunt and stupid weapons of a dictator. And we are as a nation suffering weird corruption of the dictator, a corruption that comes of excessive indulgence in the foul and dishonorable tools of war and government. We seem to be embracing an irreparable debasement: the loss of our humanity and the loss of our self-respect. For after you have lied and killed and tortured enough, and after you have deceived yourself enough, you are finished as a human being.

I was born in Czechoslovakia, and spent the first ten years of my life looking at the U.S. as if through many veils at a beautiful, a radiantly beautiful woman. My vision of the good life has for years been mixed up with an immigrant dream of "America," and what I hate most about this war is that it is ushering in a world in which traditional American utopian visions are becoming irrevocably passé. If we continue to act in Vietnam as we have thus far, the world after Vietnam will offer the impossible choice between a visionless America and a spiritless communism; I don't see that I can give my allegiance to either. It seems a reversion to the imperialistic wars between Britain and France: mere imperialism, power versus naked power. Now I sup-

pose moral regeneration always occurs, no matter what filthy practices the pipsqueak politicians of the previous generation indulge in; somehow things are always reborn. Some of my friends have found solace in Castroism, Maoism, or Negro revolution; I can understand how they feel, but I cannot share their enthusiasm. Communist utopia is too materialistic, too blind to the human being as any kind of spiritual entity. My response to the Castroist vision is like my response to Skinner's *Walden Two*: it seems to me a utopia for spiritual cripples, without real concern for the individual. And I cannot see that the Civil Rights movement, for all of the wonderful vivacity and busyness of SNCC, will culminate in anything greater than a more egalitarian version of contemporary middle class culture of the California variety--an evolution already apparent in the NAACP. The Negro has a right to California culture, but his aspirations will not bring us to utopia. The political vision which I do find appealing is a kind of American democratic socialism and, alas, that is an antiquarian dream, a pointless nostalgia. I understand of course that politically nostalgia is silly not to say thoroughly unrealistic--a self-destructive indulgence. I can perhaps find comfort in the fact that mine is at least a more advanced nostalgia than the alternative longing for a return to agrarian individualism of some of my anarchist friends. But that is not great comfort.

One cannot, however, evade public life in our world and retire into the country; it presses down everywhere and one must choose between outrage and humiliation. One cannot permit depression to lead to immobility. I am for outrage, although for an outrage based on a clear and calm vision of events--outrage and not fanaticism, not at once a better government, but eventually. To that end I believe we should all stream daily on street corners, lie on railroad tracks, and make ourselves general nuisances to the dormant public. With Thoreau, "I would remind my countrymen that they are to be men first, and Americans only at a late and convenient hour." But outrage is a pitch of emotion and one cannot live there; one must live in the more quiet recesses of one's personality, in the more tedious calm of everyday life. And unfortunately when in the contemporary world one finds outrage subsiding, the slings of our public affairs immediately splatters across one's easy chair: when one's government participates in atrocities one can escape neither guilt nor de-filement, neither the humiliation of failing to influence public policy nor the shame of being even a reluctant and recalcitrant part of that policy, and one feels only defeated and weary and dirty, dirty above all.

-Igor Webb

## ON A PAINTING by REMBRANDT

The dark lines of the hood shadow the pose,  
The face, worn by sorrow, or grief, or war,  
Or weary with life, yet composed in pain.  
Old man, outlined in shadow, dim light, and  
Stayed so long this side of nothing, you look  
where I cannot guess, golden-haltered.

- Kenneth Fields

## TO THE READER

This is the first issue for the year of the Graduate Coordinating Committee Newsletter. The Newsletter is a journal of opinion and information dedicated to intelligent discussion of politics, education, and art. We offer an outlet rarely available elsewhere on campus for extended essays on these subjects. Our pages are open to all viewpoints -- but we have a bias, determined and defined most clearly in the history of the GOC. The GOC was organized to support the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley and remains active to coordinate radical student activity on this campus. We are therefore interested primarily in a dialogue among people who have reached some agreement about political and educational philosophy. We are however more interested in discussion, in the working out of positions, than in polemics, and we therefore hold our pages open to dissent. Our first role is discussion. Our next role is to publicize the views of such organizations as Students for a Democratic Society, organizations which have begun serious and constructive analysis of contemporary political and educational problems. Our third role is to serve as a bulletin board for like-campus organizations.

If you are interested in finding out more about the Newsletter or are interested in submitting copy, contact Robert Bass or Igor Webb at the English Department.

## A Dream

Emerging from the darkened pond,  
I neared the glade,  
The trees, impenetrable, their shade  
Alive with tiny birds whose sound  
I had unalloyed.

They seemed nebular as they fled--  
From bough to bough,  
Gleam in the light the leaves allowed.  
It was the forest of the Dead;  
My future, now.

But stillness met me at each tree.  
As I drew near  
The rapid cries grew silent. Free,  
Still birds assumed mobility  
Too subtle for my eyes to see,  
Or ears to hear.

-Kenneth Fields



# THE VIOLENT AMERICAN: SELMA, SAIGON & PSYCHOSIS

I was in jail in Meridian, Mississippi, when I heard a radio announcement that the war in Vietnam was to be intensified. We were going to bomb North Vietnam and it seemed like World War III was around the corner. I thought "Jesus Christ--Wait! Give me a chance to live!" I could see my struggles and dreams blown to hell and life seemed absurdly futile. I began to feel that Vietnam was really very close to Mississippi and that Vietnam and Mississippi were linked by more than long-range missiles.

I was in jail for testing the Civil Rights Bill. I had gone to a "White" diner with a group of Negro high school students and we were surrounded by an angry mob. They screamed "Nigger lover--We're going to kill you--You son of a bitch," and they shined bright flashlights in our faces. I was terrified. I have never seen human faces with such

an animal look. We were arrested and placed in a cell with a bunch of drunken white prisoners: thieves, tough guys, bitter segregationists. It was like a scene from Kafka. We had committed no crime but there we were in jail. I thought of the cruel sneering faces of the mob and wondered why they wanted to kill me.

They were trained to accept violence. As children, they played "war games" and killed "Japs" and "Nazis" and "Robbers" and "Indians". They were taught to hate Communists, Boatniks, Jews, Yankocs, Foreigners, the United Nations, and, most of all, "Niggers" and "Nigger-lovers". They learned that violence is masculine and that sometimes it is right to kill--in war, in self-defense, in capital punishment, in "preserving the Southern way of life." They grew up in a nation where violence sells newspapers and people rush to the scene of the accident, the murder, and the fire. They served in the Army and learned the mechanics of killing. They were trained in violence and it was inevitable that these men should constitute a Mississippi lynch mob.

## ON CAMPUS COMMUNISTS

(The following are excerpts from an open letter to Stefan Possony in response to comments he made about the student movement in an interview printed in the November 1st U.S. News & World Report.)

Dear Dr. Possony:

In the November 1 issue of U.S. News and World Report, in an interview entitled "Campus Communists--America's Tim Boubi", you discuss student activists and the campus movement against the war in Vietnam. Though you are most certainly the "recognized authority on Communism and on psychological warfare techniques" that U.S. News calls you, your remarks show you essentially ignorant of the movement you attack. While you confess a lack of first-hand acquaintance with such that you analyze, you analyze it nonetheless--with generality and Guacado, and without evidence. As an activist involved in opposition to the Vietnam war, I wish to question you about your statements and to suggest what seem to me your misunderstandings and errors.

Dr. Possony, in your interview you make remarks about avocets and groups about which you confess you have no first hand knowledge, but which you analyze and judge nonetheless. At the least, this is irresponsible.

There is a connection between the communist technique of "revolutionary antimilitarism" and the riots. Now I don't mean to imply--frankly, I do not know the origin of these riots.... However, it is noticeable that the rioters were not entirely unacquainted, unskilled or unprepared. I don't know who instigated the preparation.

Here, in confessed ignorance, you imply Communist influence.

In another place you say:

There are...groups, notably the Progressive Labor Party,...and a fairly large number of other groups who, in their own minds, are Communists. They have been making considerable progress.

Of what groups do you speak, Dr. Possony? The Progressive Labor Party, as I understand it from those who have studied the group, is so small as to have no more than ideological influence, and even the most radical Marxist-Leninists at Stanford fight shy of it. By "other groups" do you mean, for instance, the Students for a Democratic Society? If so you must deal with Attorney General Katzenbach, who, when asked if "Communists were leaders in the society" replied, "by and large, no." (NY Times, 18 October 1965). Do you mean the Young Democrats, who in many parts of the country participated in the anti-Vietnam activities of October 15/16. Do you mean the Young Socialist Alliance? The Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee? The Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam?

When reminded by your interviewer that you mentioned "that some college teachers, as well as students, are involved in the Communist movement on campuses," you reply:

I don't have first-hand knowledge of this but, to judge from newspaper reports, a number of these teachers are advisers to the students or groups which are organizing the unrest.

Here the unrest you are speaking of is primarily that of opposition to the Vietnam war. At Stanford a loosely organized faculty group has conceived and executed programs meant both to encourage debate and to oppose the war. The liaison between this group and that of the students has been great and beneficial, giving many of us our first personal contact with faculty outside the confines of discipline. By judging "from newspaper reports," you have seriously called into question the motives and the reputations of those men--among them Christian Bay, Robert McAfee Brown, Charles Drekmier, Raymond Giraud, Albert Guerard, Halstad Holman, Karel de Leeuw, George Leppert, Robert Marshall, Lincoln Moses, Thomas Plaut, Charles Stein, Wilfred Stone, Paul Wallin, and others too numerous to name. Whom do you mean?

Sir, your analyses suffer from an obvious lack of first-hand acquaintance with your subject and your assertions suffer from a failure to cite text, name names, and produce evidence. Such is easily remedied. The meetings and activities of the Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam are open, and I invite you to attend. The Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee's meetings are open too, as are those of the Concerned Citizens of Palo Alto, a group not generally connected with the University. I urge that you descend from your tower and meet the subjects of your criticism.

But I have a more serious criticism to make of you than that that you are simply uninformed. Sir, your statements are not only intellectually but

(continued on page four)

These segregationists were not gangsters. Most were decent, intelligent, and moral people. It is comforting for us to dissociate ourselves from these men and see them as villains. In this way we deny responsibility for the violence. But while the Ku Klux Klan commits murder, the nation talks about "States Rights" and is unwilling to protect its Negro citizens. We demand capital punishment for murderers, but crowds watch while murder is committed in the New York streets. Sheriff Rainey is our Frankenstein. We created him, we gave him license to kill, and now we hate him and feel righteous. The "villains" speak for those who watch, and we are all responsible for the violence. Not even the most educated, sensitive, and cultivated of us should feel immune from such evil. The nation is alarmed when a white civil rights worker is killed in the South but no one is even aware when a Negro is killed. We care when a marine is killed in Vietnam but we don't care when a Vietnamese peasant is killed. If Sheriff Rainey had killed three boys in Vietnam, he would have been a national hero. Not even the victims are immune. Negro children in the Freedom School wanted to bomb Cuba and a Jew in Meridian said, "We've suffered. Let them suffer." Civil rights workers are not immune either. A civil rights worker told me about a telephone call from her daughter who cried, "He's dead, he's dead." When she learned that it was Nodgar Evers and not a member of her own family, she felt relieved. All of us have to recognize and deal with our own projections.

We use defense mechanisms to disguise our angry feelings and that is why it is difficult to recognize them. We deny our violence and claim to be a "peace-loving nation". We ignore it until it explodes in a Watts and then we wonder how it happened. We use the defense of rationalization and bury our violence in words. Negroes are killed to "preserve the Southern way of life"; Vietnamese peasants are killed to "preserve the American way of life". So Segregationists talk about God and the Constitution when they burn churches and deny the right to vote. Soldiers in Vietnam talk about Democracy when they fight for Premier Ky who idolizes Adolf Hitler, and they imagine they are fighting Communism when they kill peasants who are caught in the crossfire of the Cold War and know nothing about Capitalism or Communism. We are a nation of moralists who condemn the topless bathing suit, the Swin, the Dog, and the Dirty Word Movement, but we close our eyes and nod along violence in Mississippi and Vietnam. We use the defense of "reaction formation" and claim that we are fighting the Vietnamese because we care for them. We use "projection" and claim that the Viet Cong, which is armed with our own weapons, is a threat to our "way of life".

Projection is the basis for all of our prejudices. We don't really hate Negroes or Communists. We don't really know them. They are scapegoats--Bad Guys, people whom everyone hates, people who are too weak to fight back. We see them as symbols and they represent the frustration, loneliness, and ugliness of our lives. We hate ourselves and we turn our anger on the scapegoats.

We use the defense of apathy. We are apathetic because this is the affluent society and the war has made us more affluent. We have never known the horrors of war and we are living comfortably thousands of miles away from the battlefield. We are apathetic because we accept a statistical morality and think in terms of numbers of lives. It is less painful to identify with numbers than with suffering human beings. With our long-range missiles and napalm bombs we can avoid personal confrontation with the "enemy" and imagine that they are less than human. We are apathetic because we suppress our feelings and consider it "immature" to talk about love and hate. Our personalities are constricted and the bland are leading the bland. There is a place for anger and we should howl with rage when a Negro is lynched in the South. We are apathetic because we have "escaped from freedom" and yielded responsibility for decision-making to a "father-figure" in the White House. We are apathetic because we're afraid to act. It is realistic to be frightened. Negroes are killed for wanting to vote; a boy is in prison for burning his draft card; and President Johnson calls it treason when people dissent. But unless we act, the violence will be perpetuated.

How can we deal with our violence? We can meet in groups and talk about our feelings and help each other to see through our defenses. In this way we can recognize and deal with our prejudices and seek to achieve a personal disarmament. We can stop training our children to be violent. We can give them "peace games" rather than "war games" to play with; we can teach them, "Thou shalt not kill", with no exceptions; and we can set an example for them by being loving and nonviolent people, by refusing to fight in wars, by suffering when others are suffering, and by seeing each other as people--not as Negroes and Whites or Capitalists and Communists.

When I think of the cruel sneering faces of the Mississippi mob, I begin to understand how a Negro child or a Vietnamese peasant must feel to be hated without reason by complete strangers. It is like being in jail for no crime. It is like a scene from Kafka.

-Lynn Kabet



# ARMS ON CAMPUS

I have heard recently of one professor of physics who turned down a classified research project on principle and of another who held out until the project was awarded without security classification. One feels immediately grateful to these men, but one feels at the same time that the question should never have arisen. And one is aware that even when classified research has been banished from the campus the victory for the community will only be a symbolic one. SRI which bears the name of the University (the Trustees are sufficiently jealous of its use to have refused the word "Stanford" to the undergraduate literary magazine) is there, as Kline puts it "as a primary means of lessening an apparently serious threat to free communication among university scientists." But since university scientists consult on SRI projects, the dominating influence of secrecy has not been exercised, only transferred.

The work that professors are doing in secret may be of great benefit to mankind; I have no way of knowing, but I have a right to know. About the work of the men at SRI on chemical warfare systems, I am not even sure I want to know, although I am intensely curious about what goes on in their minds. I used to live in a boarding house in Berkeley run by a post-doctoral physicist and his wife. They were very kind to me, loved their children, knew most of the poets in Berkeley and there were readings at their house on every Tuesday night with plenty of cheap sour red wine. During the days he worked on the hill in the radiation lab under a man who was said to be gunning for a Nobel Prize. His wife said his work worried him sometimes. It worried me, too. It should worry anyone not wholly suicidal, and it should worry them that Stanford is gunning for greatness.

## STANFORD CITY

Palo Alto, Calif

POB: US ARMY

MISSILE COMMAND

Redstone Arsenal

Monteville, Ala

SURFACE/BANKS MISSILE

FIRE CONTROL SYSTEMS

PROJECT: ALXZELLE

PHASE: RSCM

GMT: \$140,000

PARALLEL COMPUTER STUDY 100

DISCRIMINATION FOR FIRE-ARMS PROGRAM MOD

T on 42-04-200-sec-57-sec 3 2204

-Robert Nass

(Months of research on the university and armaments has been done by John and Ellen Peck, Jim Sayre, Karina Praeger, and Jim Swan. The editors of the newsletter wish to thank them for their time and effort. Anyone who wishes is welcome to look through the immense amount of still largely unclassified information they compiled. Contact Igor Webb in the Freshman English Office.)

## STAFF

The Newsletter is a leisurely tri-weekly dedicated to discussion of politics, education, and war. It is open to contributions from all members of the community: graduates, undergraduates, faculty, staff, and administration. It is edited for the GOC by Robert Nass and Igor Webb with the help of Susan Nass (art), Ruth Robinson, and James Swan. Direct all mail to the editors care of the English Department. All financial contributions welcome.

# CAMPUS COMMUNISTS

morally dishonest. By generality and innuendo you cast most serious suspicions on the motives and the integrity of a movement with which you are unfamiliar and on groups and individuals which you do not deign to name and which I wager you cannot. Considering the mood of the times and the seriousness of the debate, you have overlooked the well-being of both those you accuse and of your audience, the great mass of readers to whom the word of "authority" is the word of God and they cry "Communist" and exhortation to holy war. Your statements are inflammatory, and their effect may well contribute to stifling of the most important debate this era is likely to know and the repression and persecution of one party of its participants.

David Hanson, Chairman  
STANFORD COMMITTEE  
FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

THEIR FOLLOW LISTS AND CHARTS PRESENTING SOME OF THE DATA GATHERED BY OUR RESEARCHERS:

from V & J Contractor's Guide, 1954. Published by Government Let's Publications, Washington, D.C.

For Fiscal Year 1961

This guide lists the 500 largest prime military contractors in experimental, developmental, test, and research work for this year. In this list, SRI ranks 39th, Stanford 65th. The money breakdown:

Name	Thousands of dollars
Stanford Research Institute	22,052
Fort Ord	130
Naval Park	30,765
South Pasadena	20
Stanford	216
Washington, D.C.	590
Hamilton, Mass.	228
Stanford University	8,775
Palo Alto	172
Stanford	8,603

NON-PROFIT CONTRACTORS LISTED IN ORDER

- Aerospace Corp.
- MIT
- Johns Hopkins
- Mitre Corporation
- SRI\*
- Columbia Univ.
- Rand Corp.
- University of California
- Armad Research
- Michigan Univ.
- U.S. National Aerospace Corp.
- Cornell Aeronautical
- Stanford Univ.\*

The relationship of the university, SRI, and the businessmen who run them is apt to be complicated. Some companies are represented on the Stanford Trustees, the SRI Board of Directors and are at the same time tenants of the university and clients of SRI. The following list is intended to suggest a few of these relationships.

INDUSTRIAL-COMMERCIAL RESEARCH CLIENTS OF SRI  
(from the 1955 SRI Report of Operations -- latest available)

<p>AGRY:</p> <p>1 -- Board of Directors, SRI</p> <p>2 -- Stanford Trustee</p> <p>3 -- Tenant, Stanford Industrial Park</p> <p>California Packing Corporation</p> <p>Mr. E.W. Littlefield -- 2, 3</p> <p>Mr. C.S. W. Little -- 3</p> <p>G.R. Steel</p> <p>Mr. Leslie S. Northrup -- 1</p> <p>Mr. David Packard -- 1, 2, 3</p> <p>Mr. J.B. Black -- 1, 2</p> <p>Food, Machinery, and Chemical Corp. (FMC)</p> <p>Mr. Paul L. Hovis -- 1</p> <p>Mr. J.B. Black -- 1, 2</p> <p>Mr. W.A. Lovitt -- 1, 2, 3</p> <p>Mr. T.S. Peterson -- 2</p> <p>A.P. Fuller &amp; Co.</p> <p>Mr. W.P. Fuller III -- 2</p> <p>Mr. W.P. Fuller, Jr. -- 2</p> <p>General Electric</p> <p>Mr. W. W. Linstedt -- 2, 3</p> <p>Hawson Navigation</p> <p>Mr. Norman Zwager -- 2</p> <p>Keckley Land and Farming</p> <p>Mr. T.S. Peterson -- 2</p> <p>Bechtel Corp.</p> <p>Mr. S.E. Bechtel -- 1, 2</p> <p>Bank of America, N.T. &amp; S.A.</p> <p>Mr. S. Clark Beise -- 1</p> <p>Mr. Lewis B. Lundberg -- 1</p>	<p>Facility Telephone and Telegraph</p> <p>Mr. Mark R. Sullivan -- 1</p> <p>Mr. C.E. Ducommun -- 2</p> <p>Mr. F.W. Carter -- 1</p> <p>Lockheed Aircraft</p> <p>Mr. C.E. Ducommun -- 2, 3</p> <p>Rand Corporation</p> <p>Mr. W.R. Lovitt -- 1, 2, 3</p> <p>Shell Oil</p> <p>Mr. W.B. Spight -- 1, 2</p> <p>Mr. J.B. Black -- 1, 2</p> <p>Mr. F.D. Schaffly -- 2</p> <p>Southern Pacific</p> <p>Mr. I.J. Russell -- 1</p> <p>Mr. S.D. Bechtel -- 1, 2</p> <p>Mr. J.B. Black -- 1, 2</p> <p>Mr. L.L. Sykes -- 2</p> <p>Standard Oil of Calif.</p> <p>Mr. S.C. Feltz -- 1</p> <p>Mr. T.S. Peterson -- 2</p> <p>Times-Sirror Co. (Los Angeles Times)</p> <p>Mr. Ois Chandler -- 2</p> <p>Union Oil Co.</p> <p>Mr. W.L. Stewart, Jr. -- 1, 2</p> <p>Western Pacific Railroad</p> <p>Mr. W.C. Fuller III -- 2</p>
--	--

The following is a list of some of the tenants of Stanford Industrial Park:

- AJGrid Electronics
- Applied Technology
- Bosch Instruments Corporation
- Mr. S.O. Beckman -- 1
- Clovis Corporation
- Control Data Corporation
- Energy Systems, Inc.
- Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.
- Lovitt-Packard Co.
- Mr. W.R. Lovitt -- 2
- Mr. David Packard -- 1, 2
- Mr. J. P. Dike -- 1, 2
- Mr. R.H. Brown -- 2
- Itok Corporation
- Kaiser Aircraft and Electronics
- Mr. Edward F. Kaiser -- 1
- Law Division, General Precision, Inc.
- Lockheed Missiles and Space Company
- Mr. C.E. Ducommun -- 2
- Hecrolex Associates, Inc.
- Microvax Electronics Corp.
- Precision Instruments Co.
- Varian Associates